



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,979	02/08/2002	Vincent Fischetti	NH-METHOD STREP	4199

7590 09/15/2003

JONATHAN GRANT  
SUITE 210  
2120 L STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

PRATS, FRANCISCO CHANDLER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1651

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/067,979

Applicant(s)

FISCHETTI ET AL.

Examiner

Francisco C Prats

Art Unit

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1651

**DETAILED ACTION**

The preliminary amendment filed February 8, 2002, has been received and entered.

Claims 1-7 have been cancelled.

Claims 8-43 are pending and are examined on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitation "lysin enzyme characterized by the ability to specifically destroy the cell wall of Group A Streptococci" in claims 8 and 27 renders those claims and their dependents indefinite. It is not clear how the term "specifically" qualifies the cell wall destruction performed by the enzyme, or what degree of specificity is required, or how that degree of specificity is to be measured and compared to the degradative specificities of other enzymes. Note that during prosecution

Art Unit: 1651

this term will be construed to encompass any lysin enzyme capable of destroying the cell wall of Group A Streptococci, since that property is by definition specific.

Claim 24 is indefinite because the term "said mammal" lacks antecedent basis in the claims. The term "mammal" does not appear anywhere in the claims before the recitation "said mammal" in claim 24. Claim 41 is indefinite for the same reason.

Claim 27 is indefinite because its preamble recites a method, yet the body of the claim does not recite any actual method step. Thus, it is not clear what actual step must be performed for the claimed method to be practiced. Absent some recitation of a method step, claim 27 and its dependents must be considered indefinite.

### ***Double Patenting***

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a

Art Unit: 1651

terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 8-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-14 and 17-25 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,985,271. This is a double patenting rejection. Note specifically that although the language describing the enzyme in the '271 patent differs from the language used in the claims of the instant application, the enzymes are in fact the same, having identical metes and bounds, based on the fact that the identical bacteriophage will produce the identical enzyme on the identical host bacterial strain. Because the patented claims recite the same enzyme, in the same carriers, for treatment of the same disease condition as recited in the claims under examination, a statutory double patenting rejection is clearly required.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 1651

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 8-43 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 5,985,271. While claims 8-24 were considered above to be of identical scope to the claims of the '271 patent, ambiguity presently in the claim language may necessitate a different claim construction as prosecution progresses. Thus, although all claims presented for examination in this application may be considered to not be of identical scope to the claims of the '271 patent, they are not patentably distinct from the patented claims because the patented claims recite methods for treating the same disease condition, streptococcal infection, using the same enzyme and the same carriers. Thus, a terminal disclaimer is clearly required.

Claims 8-43 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-53 of U.S. Patent No. 6,238,661, and claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,002. Although the conflicting claims are not of identical scope, they are not

Art Unit: 1651

patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims recite methods for treating the same disease condition, streptococcal infection, using the same enzyme and the same carriers. Thus, a terminal disclaimer is clearly required.

Claims 8-43 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application Nos. 09/560, and 650 10/067,995. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they recite methods of administering the same enzymes to treat infections caused by the same bacterial agents in the same part of the body.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Francisco C Prats whose telephone number is 703-308-3665. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, with alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Wityshyn can be reached on 703-308-4743. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Francisco C Prats  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1651

FCP



BRUCE KISLUK, DIRECTOR  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600